

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, and 8-14 remain pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration.

Amendment

Claim 1 has been amended as set forth in the proposed amendment submitted for the interview held on 25 August 2008, namely to more clearly define the setting/notifying features. Specifically, claim 1 defines setting whether an electronic mail notification is automatically executed, and defines an operating section that displays first and second buttons. A search result is transmitted as an email with the searched original electronic document data file when the displayed first button is operated, whereas the search result is transmitted as an email without the searched original electronic document data file when the displayed second button is operated. This arrangement makes it possible to set in advance whether the email notification is automatically executed, and to determine whether the email notification is executed, in response to the user's operation of the buttons displayed in the operating section.

Independent claims 11, 12, and 14 have been revised to parallel the changes made in claim 1. Claim 5 also has been amended to reflect the changes made in claim 1. No new matter has been introduced.

Art Rejection & Interview

Claims 1, 5, and 9-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ramsay (USP 5,502,576) in view of Hussey (USP 5,826,269) and Guha (USP 6,539,373). Claim 13 was rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ramsay in view of Hussey, Guha, and Langseth (USP 6,694,316). Claim 14 was rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hussey in view of Abdel-Mottaleb (USP 6,285,995) and Guha. Claim 3 was rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ramsay in view of Hussey, Guha, and Seder (USPGP 2002/0164053). Lastly, claims 2 and 8 were rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ramsay in view of Hussey, Guha, and Cullen (USP 5,893,908).

Applicant thanks the examiner for granting a telephonic interview. During the interview, the undersigned explained that the above-applied references, in particular Hussey, do not disclose or teach the claimed configuration set forth in proposed claim 1, which is now formally incorporated in this Amendment. Specifically, none of the applied references would have disclosed or taught providing an operating section/unit that displays two buttons for determining whether the email notification should include the searched original document file. The examiner

agreed to give full reconsideration of the claims based on the notification features now set forth in independent claims 1, 11, 12, and 14.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that the pending claims patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

/Lyle Kimms 082908/

LYLE KIMMS

REG. NO. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. Box 826

ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826

703-726-6020 (PHONE)

703-726-6024 (FAX)

29 AUGUST 2008

DATE